

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/645,014	08/23/2000	Paul J. Lucas	P-2138D1	1899	
75	90 08/03/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
STEVEN J. ROCCI			CHAVIS,	CHAVIS, JOHN Q	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
46TH FLOOR	TENOE		2124		
PHILADELPH	IA, PA 19103		DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/645,014	LUCAS ET AL.					
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John Chavis	2124 ·					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 20 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a ition in				
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official of the control of the co	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amounth that the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejecting HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			,				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	·						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	nplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancelNOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed	amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		idered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which wer	e newly				
7 \(\subseteq \) For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-45</u> .			•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on 20 May 2004 is a)	□ approved or b) □ disapprovel	ed by the Examine	-				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme							
10. Other:							
10.L. Ottlet.							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the prior art of record is sufficient for the claims addressed in the final action and the newly presented claims raise new issues that require further consideration and/ or search.

JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124

Best Available Copy